



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,475	12/11/2000	Thomas C.K. Yuen	SRSLABS.271A	5124

20995 7590 11/04/2005

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

GRAHAM, ANDREW R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2644

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/734,475

Applicant(s)

YUEN ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew Graham

Art Unit

2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 11-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2644

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 18-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed March 21, 2001, less the reference WO 96/16548, as well as the information disclosure statement filed June 10, 2005 have been considered by the examiner.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the application number on page 10, line 3, "90/411143", appears as if it should read "09/411143", based on the given title of the referenced application.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. The claims are objected to because of the following informalities:

- in Claim 1, the third reference to "a second broadcast location" in line 19 appears as if it should be written as "the second internet broadcast location" to clearly indicate that this referenced

Art Unit: 2644

second location is the same second location referenced in preceding limitations in the claim

- in Claim 1, line 27 appears as if it needs an "and" at the end, thus reading "the two-channel audio output; and"; such an addition would clarify that the final two limitations of 'enhancing' and 'correcting' at the end of the claim are part of the conditional "if" clause of the claim, which would be consistent with the applicant's disclosure

- in Claim 18, the references to "the first Internet broadcast partner" in lines 16 and 17 should read "the first Internet broadcast location" to use language consistent with lines 5 and 6

- in Claim 18, line 22 appears as if it needs an "and" at the end, thus reading "the two-channel audio output; and"; such an addition would clarify that the final two limitations of 'enhancing' and 'correcting' at the end of the claim are part of the conditional "if" clause of the claim, which would be consistent with the applicant's disclosure

Appropriate correction or clarification is respectfully requested.

Art Unit: 2644

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-6 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (USPN 6694027) in view of Fitch et al (USPN 6647389), Klayman et al (WO 98/20709), Klayman et al (EP 0756437 A2), and Fucarile (US 6766305). Hereafter, "Fitch et al" will be referred to as "Fitch". The Klayman et al (WO 98/20709) reference will be referred to as "Klayman '709". The Klayman et al (EP 0756437 A2) reference will be referred to as "Klayman '437". "Fucarile et al" will be referred to as "Fucarile".

Schneider teaches an encode and decode matrix system that may be utilized with the storage or transmission of data.

Regarding **Claim 1**, Schneider teaches:

A method of delivering a surround-sound audio signal (eleven channels; col. 4, lines 17-21) lines over the Internet to a client using conventional Internet stereo sound streaming techniques (transmitted using conventional transmission formats, known formats disclosed as including two channel transmission media over internet; col. 1, lines 23-33; col. 5, lines 44-46) while maintaining

Art Unit: 2644

compatibility with multiple audio signal sources (property of 5-2-5 encoding and decoding; col. 4, lines 21-25)

the method comprising:

providing a multi-channel audio signal source (eleven channels, 11A-14A, 23, 11C-14C) left mid surround 15A channels; col. 5, lines 16-26) at a first Internet broadcast location (transmitted using conventional transmission formats, known formats disclosed as including two channel transmission over internet; col. 1, lines 23-33; col. 5, lines 44-46; physical "location" inherent to implementation of encoder system of Figure 3A)

encoding (with 10A,10B,20) the multi-channel audio signal source into a two-channel format (5-2-5 matrix encoded output of encoder 20; two channel transmission format disclosed by Schneider; col. 1, lines 23-33; col. 4, lines 35-37),

converting the encoded two-channel audio signal source (result of 5-2-5 matrix encoding aspect of 20) to a streaming format for transmission over the Internet (also function of 20; col. 4, lines 35-37; col. 5, lines 37-40 and 44-46; Figure 3A),

transmitting the streaming format (col. 5, lines 44-46) of the encoded audio signal source to a client location (site of physical implementation of system comprising decoder of Figure 3B in internet audio transmission arrangement);

recovering the streaming format of the encoded audio signal into an encoded two-channel audio format (function of 30, two channels

Art Unit: 2644

necessary for complementary 5-2-5 decoding aspect of 30; col. 4, lines 35-39)

decoding the two-channel format (two encoded channels from transmission stream initially encoded by 5-2-5 encoder (20); col. 1, lines 23-33; col. 4, lines 35-39) of the audio signal into a multi-channel audio output signal (outputs 43A-47A, 34, 43B-47B) for playback by the client (application of the signal to system outputs; col. 5, lines 53-67; col. 6, lines 1-13),

As noted above, Schneider teaches that such a system may be utilized with conventional transmission formats (col. 5, lines 44-46). Schneider also teaches that transmission media include two discrete channel media, and that existing transmission systems include internet audio.

However, Schneider does not clearly specify:

- that the method further comprises permitting the client to access, decode, and playback a plurality of types of audio source signals from a second Internet broadcast location

Fitch discloses a system involving internet audio transmission, wherein multiple streams are available to a receiving or client computer, and a user of the system may select from a plurality of streams for playback.

Specifically regarding Claim 1, Fitch teaches:

Art Unit: 2644

permitting the client to access, decode, and playback a plurality of types of audio source signals (col. 6, lines 1-15) from a second Internet broadcast location (col. 5, lines 58-66)

To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to include the multichannel encoded audio stream of Schneider as part of a larger, internet audio transmission system comprising multiple, additional media streams, including those with different encodings and different geographical origins, such as disclosed in the system of Fitch. The motivation behind such an implementation would have been such additional streams would have enabled a user to select up to date media content. Differently formatted streams would have enabled streams to be rated and ranked based at least in part on user-perceived quality of the stream format. Access to differently encoded stream formats would have also enabled streams to be filtered for user access based on the user's equipment profile. Access to multiple streams from different server locations would have prevented regional outages from interfering with user access to the streams.

However, Schneider in view of Fitch does not clearly teach or suggest further signal processing for the received, decoded multichannel audio signal, comprising:

- wherein at least one of the plurality of audio source signals are processed to produce a two-channel output,

Art Unit: 2644

- said two-channel audio output configured to simulate said multichannel surround sound audio output when played on a pair of loudspeakers
- correcting a perceived width of the apparent sound stage associated with the two-channel audio output

Klayman '709 discloses a system that performs multichannel audio signal processing.

Specifically regarding Claim 1, Klayman '709, when considered in view of the teachings of Schneider and Fitch, at least suggests:

- wherein at least one of the plurality of audio source signals (multiple signal sources of Fitch, Stereo Flag and Stream Codec, col. 8, lines 22 and 27, in view of multi-channel codec/format of Schneider) are processed (by 60) to produce a two-channel output (62,64) (page 12, lines 3-10),
- said two-channel audio output configured to simulate said multichannel surround sound audio output when played on a pair of loudspeakers (page 32, lines 13-29; page 15, lines 12-25)
- correcting a perceived width of the apparent sound stage associated with the two-channel audio output (page 17, lines 19-23)

To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to incorporate the audio enhancement system of Klayman '709 as part of the signal processing circuitry

Art Unit: 2644

applied to a multichannel audio signal source from a broadcast provider in the system of Schneider in view of Fitch. The motivation behind such a modification would have been that such processing circuitry would have prevented the full capability of the multichannel source from being left untapped, which would have left a user with an inferior listening experience. The processing circuitry of Klayman '709 would have enabled multichannel reproduction to be fully used with computers and video players that lack more than two playback channels.

Klayman '709 teaches that a bass signal is enhanced and that the sound stage is broadened (page 12, lines 10-11; page 17, lines 21-23)

However, as part of the audio channel correction circuitry, Schneider in view of Fitch and Klayman '709 does not clearly teach or suggest:

- enhancing bass response associated with the two channel audio output
- correcting a perceived height of an apparent sound stage associated with the two channel output

Further audio signal correction and enhancement circuitry are disclosed in Klayman '437.

Specifically regarding Claim 1, Klayman '437, in view of the references applied above, at least suggests:

Art Unit: 2644

- correcting a perceived height of an apparent sound stage associated with the two channel output (col. 27, lines 33-46; col. 39, lines 29-49)
- enhancing bass response associated with the two channel audio output (col.26, line 53-col.27, line 13; or, col. 37, lines 49-58)

To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to incorporate the signal processing circuitry corresponding to the above citations as part of the two channel signal processing circuitry in the system of Schneider in view of Fitch and Klayman '709. The motivation behind such a modification would have been that such processing would have generated an apparent location for a speaker system with a elevation different from the that of the actual speakers through which the sound is emitted. Such processing would have compensated the sound from speakers positioned at an acoustically undesirable location beneath a user's ears. Such undesirable positioning may otherwise result in distortion of the emitted sound. Such processing circuitry would have also prevented unpleasurable or unrealistic bass reproduction and potential speaker damage from clipping, or alternatively, compensated for bass frequency reduction caused by a sound reproduction environment.

As noted in Schneider, signal processing components implemented as part of such a system may be commercially available for use (col. 4, lines 21-23).

Art Unit: 2644

However, the system of Schneider in view of Fitch, Klayman '709, and Klayman '437 do not clearly specify any steps for verifying the nature of the use of any such commercially available components.

Specifically regarding Claim 1, Schneider in view of Fitch, Klayman '709, and Klayman '437, do not clearly teach or suggest:

- determining whether a second internet broadcast location is a licensed broadcast location and
- if the second internet broadcast location is a licensed broadcast location permitting certain signal processing to be performed

Fucarile discloses a licensing system for freely distributed information, wherein such information comprises content and a plugin for processing said content.

Specifically regarding Claim 1, Fucarile in view of the teachings of Schneider, Fitch, Klayman '709, and Klayman '437, at least suggests:

- determining whether a second internet broadcast location (content server 200) is a licensed broadcast location (content distribution of 200 in view of transmission of multichannel, internet audio in Schnider; col. 8, line 62-col.9, line 22 of Fucarile) and
- if the second internet broadcast location is a licensed broadcast location, permitting certain signal processing to be performed (application of functionality of signal processing of Klayman '709 and Klayman '437 on input source, in view of permitted

Art Unit: 2644

functionality for validly licensed plug-in, based on received valid license indication, col. 10, lines 30-54 of Fucaline)

To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious incorporate the license checking process of Fucarile as part of the input audio signal reception process from an internet audio provider in the system of Schneider in view of Fitch, Klayman '709, and Klayman '437. The motivation behind such a modification would have been that such checking would have enabled a software provider to freely distribute license use of the software without controlling access to either the involved content or software. Such a licensing system would have also enabled a license provider to obtain statistics yielding a rough model of the active user base served by each license.

Regarding **Claim 2**, Fitch particularly teaches:

the plurality of types of audio source signals includes conventional stereo signals ("Stereo Flag", col. 7, lines 23-26; col. 8, line 27). It is further noted that the applicant has listed stereo audio as a prior art distribution format (page 1, lines 18-20).

Regarding **Claim 3**, Schneider in view of Fitch teaches:

the plurality of types of audio source signals includes Dolby surround encoded audio signals (Schneider teaches that Dolby formats are known in the prior art, col. 1, lines 33-38; Fitch teaches the use of a plurality of different codecs in a user system, and that the same media may be encoded with different codecs, col. 5, lines 1-15 and 58-61; implementing a media stream in a Dolby surround format would have

Art Unit: 2644

increased the number of formats available to a user, broadening selection available to meet a user's personal selection or hardware profile. It is further noted that the applicant has disclosed Dolby surround formats as being available in prior art (page 2, lines 6-7).

Regarding **Claim 4**, Fitch teaches:

the plurality of types of audio source signals includes a monaural signal (by virtue of no "Stereo Flag" or stereo signal being not present, col. 7, lines 23-26; col. 8, line 27). It is further noted that the applicant has listed monophonic audio as a prior art distribution format (page 1, lines 18-20).

Regarding **Claim 5**, Fitch teaches:

the client represents an individual personal computer user (col. 1, lines 49-65; col. 4, lines 10-19).

Regarding **Claim 6**, Schneider teaches:

encoding the multi-channel audio signal source into a two-channel format is performed using the CS 5.1 encoding method (col. 4, lines 17-25; col. 5, lines 10-16).

Regarding **Claim 21**, please refer above to the rejection of the similar limitations of Claim 1, noting the components from the references cited therein.

6. **Claims 18-20** are rejected as being unpatentable over Schneider as applied above, and in further view of Klayman et al (WO 98/20709), Klayman et al (EP 0756437 A2), and Fucarile (US 6766305). The Klayman et al (WO 98/20709) reference will be referred to as

Art Unit: 2644

"Klayman '709". The Klayman et al (EP 0756437 A2) reference will be referred to as "Klayman '437". "Fucarile et al" will be referred to as "Fucarile".

As discussed above, Schneider teaches an encode and decode matrix system that may be utilized with the storage or transmission of data.

Regarding **Claim 18**, Schneider teaches:

A method of delivering a surround-sound audio signal (eleven channels; col. 4, lines 17-21) lines over the Internet to a client using Internet stereo sound streaming techniques (transmitted using conventional transmission formats, known formats disclosed as including two channel transmission media over internet; col. 1, lines 23-33; col. 5, lines 44-46) while maintaining compatibility with multiple audio signal sources (property of 5-2-5 encoding and decoding; col. 4, lines 21-25)

the method comprising:

providing a multi-channel audio signal source (eleven channels, 11A-14A, 23, 11C-14C) left mid surround 15A channels; col. 5, lines 16-26) at a first Internet broadcast location (transmitted using conventional transmission formats, known formats disclosed as including two channel transmission over internet; col. 1, lines 23-33; col. 5, lines 44-46; physical "location" inherent to implementation of encoder system of Figure 3A)

encoding (with 10A,10B,20) the multi-channel audio signal source into a two-channel format (5-2-5 matrix encoded output of encoder 20;

Art Unit: 2644

two channel transmission format disclosed by Schneider; col. 1, lines 23-33; col. 4, lines 35-37),

converting the encoded two-channel audio signal source (result of 5-2-5 matrix encoding aspect of 20) to a streaming format for transmission over the Internet (also function of 20; col. 4, lines 35-37; col. 5, lines 37-40 and 44-46; Figure 3A),

transmitting the streaming format (col. 5, lines 44-46) of the encoded audio signal source to a client location (site of physical implementation of system comprising decoder of Figure 3B in internet audio transmission arrangement);

recovering the streaming format of the encoded audio signal into an encoded two-channel audio format (function of 30, two channels necessary for complementary 5-2-5 decoding aspect of 30; col. 4, lines 35-39)

decoding the two-channel format (two encoded channels from transmission stream initially encoded by 5-2-5 encoder (20); col. 1, lines 23-33; col. 4, lines 35-39) of the audio signal into a multi-channel audio output signal (outputs 43A-47A, 34, 43B-47B) (application of the signal to system outputs; col. 5, lines 53-67; col. 6, lines 1-13),

However, Schneider does not specify:

- processing said multi-channel surround sound audio output to produce a two-channel audio output,

Art Unit: 2644

- said two-channel audio output configured to simulate said multi-channel surround sound audio output when played on a pair of loudspeakers.

- correcting a perceived width of the apparent sound stage associated with the two-channel audio output

Klayman '709 discloses a system that performs multichannel audio signal processing.

Specifically regarding Claim 1, Klayman '709, when considered in view of the teachings of Schneider and Fitch, at least suggests:

- processing multi-channel surround sound audio output (multi-channel codec/format of Schneider, in view of multi-channel source of Klayman '709 processing by 60) to produce a two-channel output (62,64) (page 12, lines 3-10),
- said two-channel audio output configured to simulate said multichannel surround sound audio output when played on a pair of loudspeakers (page 32, lines 13-29; page 15, lines 12-25)
- correcting a perceived width of the apparent sound stage associated with the two-channel audio output (page 17, lines 19-23)

To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to incorporate the audio enhancement system of Klayman '709 as part of the signal processing circuitry applied to a multichannel audio signal source from a broadcast

Art Unit: 2644

provider in the system of Schneider. The motivation behind such a modification would have been that such processing circuitry would have prevented the full capability of the multi-channel source from being left untapped, which would have left a user with an inferior listening experience. The processing circuitry of Klayman '709 would have enabled multichannel reproduction to be fully used with computers and video players that lack more than two playback channels.

Klayman '709 teaches that a bass signal is enhanced and that the sound stage is broadened (page 12, lines 10-11; page 17, lines 21-23)

However, as part of the audio channel correction circuitry, Schneider in view of Klayman '709 does not clearly teach or suggest:

- enhancing bass response associated with the two channel audio output
- correcting a perceived height of an apparent sound stage associated with the two channel output

Further audio signal correction and enhancement circuitry are disclosed in Klayman '437.

Specifically regarding Claim 1, Klayman '437, in view of the references applied above, at least suggests:

- correcting a perceived height of an apparent sound stage associated with the two channel output (col. 27, lines 33-46; col. 39, lines 29-49)

Art Unit: 2644

- enhancing bass response associated with the two channel audio output (col.26, line 53-col.27, line 13; or, col. 37, lines 49-58)

To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to incorporate the signal processing circuitry corresponding to the above citations as part of the two channel signal processing circuitry in the system of Schneider in view of Klayman '709. The motivation behind such a modification would have been that behind the inclusion of such processing would have been that such processing would have generated an apparent location for a speaker system with an elevation different from the that of the actual speakers through which the sound is emitted. Such processing would have compensated the sound from speakers positioned at an acoustically undesirable location beneath a user's ears. Such undesirable positioning may otherwise result in distortion of the emitted sound. Such processing circuitry would have also prevented unpleasurable or unrealistic bass reproduction and potential speaker damage from clipping, or alternatively, compensated for bass frequency reduction caused by a sound reproduction environment.

As noted in Schneider, signal processing components implemented as part of a system may be commercially available for use (col. 4, lines 21-23).

However, the system of Schneider in view of Klayman '709, and Klayman '437 do not clearly specify any steps for verifying the nature of the use of any such commercially available components.

Art Unit: 2644

Specifically regarding Claim 1, Schneider in view of Fitch, Klayman '709, and Klayman '437, do not clearly teach or suggest:

- determining whether a first internet broadcast (partner) location is a licensed broadcast location and
- if the second internet broadcast (partner) location is a licensed broadcast location permitting certain signal processing to be performed

Fucarile discloses a licensing system for freely distributed information, wherein such information comprises content and a plugin for processing said content.

Specifically regarding Claim 1, Fucarile in view of the teachings of Schneider, Klayman '709, and Klayman '437, at least suggests:

- determining whether a second internet broadcast location (content server 200) is a licensed broadcast location (content transmitted by server 200 in view of transmission of multichannel, internet audio in Schneider; col. 8, line 62-col.9, line 22) and
- if the second internet broadcast location is a licensed broadcast location, permitting certain signal processing to be performed (signal processing of Klayman '709 and Klayman '437 on input source, in view of permitted functionality for validly licensed plugin, based on received valid license indication, col. 10, lines 30-54 of Fucarile)

To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious incorporate the license checking process of Fucarile as part of the input audio signal reception

Art Unit: 2644

process from an internet audio provider in the system of Schneider in view of Klayman '709, and Klayman '437. The motivation behind such a modification would have been that such checking would have enabled a software provider to freely distribute license use of the software without controlling access to either the involved content or software. Such a licensing system would have also enabled a license provider to obtain statistics yielding a rough model of the active user base served by each license.

Regarding **Claim 19**, Schneider teaches:

said encoding comprises encoding using a CS 5.1 encoder (col. 4, lines 21-23).

Regarding **Claim 20**, Schneider teaches:

said decoding comprises decoding using a CS 5.1 decoder (col. 4, lines 23-25 and 37-47).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the


Art Unit: 2644


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Graham whose telephone number is 571-272-7517. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Andrew Graham
Examiner
A.U. 2644


VIVIAN CHIN
SUPERVISOR/PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600